

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-21, 23-27, and 29-34, as amended, remain herein. Claims 8-11, 15, 21, 24-26, and 30-32 are currently withdrawn from consideration. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in applicants' specification at p. 9, lines 1-32.

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshida et al. U.S. Patent 5,973,878 and Miura et al. U.S. Patent 6,341,896. However, neither Yoshida nor Miura discloses "a stress between said components of at least one of the hydrodynamic thrust bearing and the hydrodynamic radial bearing is at least 300 Pa when the hydrodynamic bearing motor is in a stationary state," as recited in applicants' amended claims 1 and 3.

The Office Action admits that Yoshida fails to disclose that elements of the hydrodynamic radial bearing, and the hydrodynamic thrust bearing comprises austenitic stainless steel. Miura fails to disclose what Yoshida lacks. Miura discloses that a shaft comprises austenitic stainless steel, but fails to disclose a stress between a thrust bearing and a radial bearing being at least 300 Pa.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Yoshida and Miura to provide every element of applicants' claims 1 and 3. Miura discloses using austenitic stainless steel as a material of a rotary shaft so that its thermal expansion coefficient would be substantially the same as the metal of a bearing sleeve. Nothing in Yoshida or Miura would have motivated one of ordinary skill to maintain a stress magnitude of 300 Pa between a thrust bearing and a radial bearing. This stress is necessary to transform austenitic stainless steel to magnetic stainless steel, which allows abraded powder to be attracted to a magnet, as disclosed in applicants specification. Neither Yoshida nor Miura discloses any such benefit.

For the foregoing reasons, Yoshida and Miura are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 12, 14, 18, 20, 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshida, Miura, and Toshimitsu et al. U.S. Patent 5,366,298. As discussed above, Yoshida and Miura fail to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, from which claims 12, 14, 18, 20, 23 and 29 depend. Toshimitsu fails to disclose what Yoshida and Miura lack, including austenitic stainless steel and a stress of 300 Pa between a thrust bearing and a radial bearing. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Yoshida, Miura, and Toshimitsu to provide every limitation of applicants' claim 1. None of the above references contains any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill to maintain a stress magnitude of 300 Pa between a thrust bearing and a radial bearing. For the foregoing reasons, Yoshida, Miura, and Toshimitsu are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 12, 14, 18, 20, 23 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 2, 5, 7, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, 27, 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshida, Miura, and Toshimitsu. Claims 16, 22 and 28 have been canceled, mooting the rejections thereof. As discussed above, Yoshida, Miura, and Toshimitsu fail to disclose or suggest "a stress between said components of at least one of the hydrodynamic thrust bearing and the hydrodynamic radial bearing is at least 300 Pa when the hydrodynamic bearing motor is in a stationary state," as recited in applicants' amended claim 2. As discussed above in Section 2, none of the above references contains any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary

skill to maintain a stress magnitude of 300 Pa between a thrust bearing and a radial bearing. For the foregoing reasons, Yoshida, Miura, and Toshimitsu are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 2, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, all claims 1-7, 12-14, 17-20, 23, 27, 29, 33 and 34 are now fully in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: March 5, 2009



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Adam C. Ellsworth
Reg. No. 55,152

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.5408